I: Gordon E-4, 5 (no date) 1907 AR7 Khasi AR7

Khasi of the Uplands to marry a Bhoi or War woman, and 101
a disgrace to marry a Lyngam. These divisions are sub- 582
divided into a number of septs, taking Mr. Risley's definition of 614
"sept" as being the largest exogamous division of the tribe. It will, however, be more convenient to speak of these septs as "clans," the word "clan" having been used in other parts of this Monograph and by other writers.

Many of the clans trace their descent from ancestresses or 614
kiew (grandmothers), who are styled *ki Iawbei-Tynrai*, lit. grandmothers of the root (i.e. the root of the tree of the clan). In some of the clans, the name of this ancestress survives; take as instances the Mylliem-ngap and Mylliem-plah clans of the Khyrim State, the names of the ancestresses of the clans being *ka ngap* (honey, i.e. the sweet one), and *ka plah* respectively. [176]
This tribal ancestress, as will be seen in the paragraph of the monograph dealing with ancestor-worship, is greatly reverenced, in fact, she may almost be said to be deified. The descendants of one ancestress of the clan, *Ka Iawbei Tynrai*, are called *shi kur* or one clan. We then come to the division of the *kpoh* or sub-clan, all the descendants of one great grandmother (*ka Iawbei Tynrai*), being styled *shi kpoh*. The next division is the *iing* (lit. house) or family. It is almost in- [512]
variably the case that the grandmother, her daughters and the daughter's children, live together under one roof, the grandmother during her life-time being the head of the house. The grandmother is styled *ka Iawbei Khynraw*, or the young grandmother, to distinguish her from the other two grandmothers, *ka Iawbei-tynrai* and *ka Iawbei-tynnuor* who have been mentioned above. The young grandmother, her daughters and their children are said to belong to *shi iing*, one house, the word *iing* in this instance possessing amongst the Khasis the same significance as the English word *family*.

We will now see how the Khasi clan (*kur* or *jaid*) grew out 614
of the Khasi family (*iing*). Let us take the example of the 773
great Diengdoh clan of Cherra. Disregarding the myth that the Diengdohs are descended from a mermaid, it may be stated that there seems to be a fairly general belief amongst the Diengdohs that their first ancestress or *kiew* came from the

Ik Chattopadhyay S-4, 5 (no date) 1941 AR7 Khasi AR7

for difference in sex, is applied to both. The corresponding uncle and aunt by marriage are referred to by terms which make this clear. The husband of the father's sister is a "Ma" like the mother's brother and is also referred to as "Kni." But as his position by age is unimportant, the adjective of position is lacking in his case. Similarly the mother's brother's wife and the father's sister have a common term "Nia"; but the latter has her relationship through the father clearly indicated by the additional term "Kha" which refers to kinship through a male. The mother's brother's wife is, on the contrary, an aunt by marriage. The husband of the father's sister derives his term through his wife; and the wife of the mother's brother, through her husband. The identities M.B. = F.S.H. and M.B.W. = F.S. are therefore derived indirectly and are not original. Hodson's hypothesis that they represent actual identity of kinship in an earlier dual society therefore turns out to be superfluous.

Reciprocally, a man refers to his sister's children by a term which is different from that for his own children. A woman also refers to her brother's children by this term which is different from that used for her own or her sister's children. As indicated, the M.B. as well as the F.S. are both on a parallel footing, and are practically labelled together, allowing for differences of sex.

We may say that there are, in Khasi society, two clearly recognised units. One of these is the house and household, where the men and women have been born. Inside this house group, the sisters have similar rights, actual as well as potential. As we have seen, on the death of one sister, where there is no female issue, another sister takes her place in continuing the traditional religious entity of the group. The brothers again, among themselves, take one another's place in succession, in the matter of authority, and of management of the family property. The other unit is that of the woman, her husband and the children. We may refer to it as the unit set up by marriage.

Referring to the first type, we may say that the second type results from the men of the house going out to marry women of other houses. As the sons settle down in the wife's mother's house and later on set up a separate house on her land, the continuity of tradition in the house of birth is kept up by the women who remain behind.

It would however be a mistake to suppose that the bond between the members born in a house is severed on marriage. We have noted before that the lodge of a dead man returns eventually to his mother's house, for final deposition in the clan cemetary, or at least that of the extended household. The bond between the mother's brother and sister's children has also been noted as well as the authority exercised by the former over the extended family.

Further links between a man and his mother's Kur will appear from a study of the rules of inheritance and land tenure with regard to men. Any property that a man acquires before marriage belongs to his mother's house. Mystri U Gobu Rai, for example, earned money before his marriage, and he purchased some land with this amount, in a village called Mawlieh. It will go to his sisters and their heiresses on his death. The earnings of a man after marriage, and after he has settled down in his wife's mother's house (or wife's house), among Khasis proper, generally go to the wife and daughters on death. But any gifts made by the parents at marriage have to be returned on death. Similarly, if a man has earned money after marriage, independently of his wife's capital, a part can be claimed on death by the man's mother's group.

Again, if a man returns to his mother's village after marriage, he can exercise his rights to cultivate the common land there. Every village community has its [illegible]
Ri Raid. As David Roy states (CR), "people can occupy a vacant land where they build their houses and cultivate. For cultivation purposes land not more than can be cultivated is taken. The occupant can sell his house and the site and the garden of

(42) or take such a clan member with the name Ka Sing Lan. She has two sons and five daughters, and in addition two brothers and two sisters who are all married. Also each of the five daughters and two sisters has four children. These forty-six people live with the clan mother and form the family clan of the Lan. To these we also add the sons and brothers, the nephews and grandsons, but not their children. The latter have nothing to do with the family Lan but belong to the family clan of their wives, live with that clan and are counted to it. Likewise neither the husband of Ka Sing Lan, nor the husbands of the various daughters, sisters, nieces, and granddaughters belong here. They are all counted with their own clans, live and work with them according to Khasi custom, and only visit their wives occasionally perhaps after dark.

(43) (44) The entire clan-family of Lan is housed in 3 or 4 huts, which all stand next to each other in a semicircle or are built one above the other on the slope of a hill, according to the character of the land. A garden frequently surrounds them in which maize, sweet potatoes, potato-like roots of Colocasia and Dioscorea, bananas and, on the southern slopes of the Khasi Mountains, also coffee, pineapples, and other fruits are cultivated. A circle of bamboo canes that is so important for building purposes, household objects, and /Life/ implements surrounds the garden and huts. This bamboo cane grows up so thick as an arm to a height of 15 or 16 meters and at the same time forms a good protection against bad weather. A wall (consisting) of thrown-up earth encloses everything, forming an enclosed farm, prevents entrapped access, and protects cattle and crops from the attacks and devastations of wild animals.

(45) (46) What is considered the family property of such a clan? Primarily it is the land, the gardens, the rice fields, woods, fallow mountain and grazing lands. On the southern slopes of the Khasi Mountains there are fields for the cultivation of rape, orange groves, betel groves, plantations of betel palms and of pepper vines which far and wide are so highly treasured for betel chewing as a means of pleasure. (1)

1. Cf. Berlie, Im Stromtal des Brahmaputra, /In the River Valley of the Brahmaputra/ (Munich, 1923), pp. 307 ff.

(47) Usually there is so much land available that the family-clan can nourish itself properly and also increase in number.

(48) (49) According to its size and wealth a family clan also owns a corresponding number of cows, oxen, bees, pigs, and goats. Neither the milk nor the flesh of the cows is used. They are kept for the

absence of A, D, E, K and N, C succeeds to the office if he is grown up. If C is too young, a choice arises for F's husband, if F is alive, if not, for W's husband.[1] In the event that none of these males be available, finally the office is taken by F and then by W. It should be noted that the office assumed by F's husband, W's husband, F or W could have to be returned to W's son, as soon as he comes of age. These cases are considered a temporary measure to meet an emergency.

The Khasi follow a strict descent line, and neither a classificatory uncle (or brother) is allowed to take over the authority of the ring.[2] Though if there is no successor to the property, a daughter may be adopted from the nearest matrilineal descent group. Instead of the adoption of a daughter, the following steps may also be taken. The property is handed over to the nearest matrilineal descent group; or if there is a son, he may inherit his father's or mother's acquired property, but ancestral property should go to a matrilineal kin. In each case, the particular ring actually becomes extinct: in the former case, though the property is handed over to another ring, this ring belongs to the same matrilineal line; in the latter, the property goes eventually to the son's wife and to his children, i.e. to ring of an entirely different line. The latter arrangement suggests that though the Khasi follow the strict descent line, so far as the acquired property is concerned, the child has primary rights over the mother's other matrilineal kin, as expressed by the son's right of inheritance in the absence of a daughter. In this way, the ring may become extinct by the death of the female member who has no daughter.

The Khasi consider the ring institution as the basic and most important functional unit; it represents also the religious unit which keeps ancestral property and shares a common religious ceremony. This is indeed the key to the whole Khasi social organization.

III. Residence Unit

In this section I shall deal with the relation between the ring and or between the marital family (husband, wife and children) and the ring. Among the Garo, the unit corresponds to the actual group of individuals residing within one household. Upon this point the Khasi system is more complicated since spouses of members of the ring are excluded from the ring.

1. This would only arise in cases where the husbands of F or W live in the same household as their wives.
2. In the case of succession to the chieftainship, a classificatory sister's son is taken in the absence of a direct nephew or brother.

15: Nakase E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR? Khasi AR?

592 The Khasi domestic unit (co-residential group) can be divided into four categories:

a. Households consisting of wife, husband and their children, wife's unmarried sisters and brothers—sometimes including widowed or divorced.

b. Households including all members of an ing (excluding their spouses from members of c). In this type, larger households contain all the descendants of three or more generations from one woman (in this case, an ing corresponds to a lineage).

c. Households of intermediate type between a and b. Husbands are supposed to live in their wife's house, but they often go back to their sister's house for meals, and sometimes sleep there. They are supposed to work in their wife's field but they might work in their mother's (sister's) field, if necessary. This tendency is especially strong among newly married couples before they have a child.

d. Households consisting of only one elementary family. This rarely happens when a man married a non-Khasi.

Most Khasi households are of types a, 3 and 4 and these three types are usually found within one village. They were found in the four villages in which I worked. It is to these dwelling units that I have given the name of house in Lists 6 and 9. Category a, according to the information of Khasis and Jaintias, was used to be found among the Jaintias, though nowadays such cases are rapidly decreasing, changing into forms a, 3 and 4. The members of category a belong to an ing, which structurally corresponds to the *lawsad* of the Nayar, and the *parwa* of the Minangkabau.

Category a may have been practised among certain of the Khasi a long time ago. Khasi people said that as recently as their father's generation, there were many husbands who stayed at the mother's house after their marriage and visited the wife at night. Nowadays, visiting husbands are very unusual cases in the Khasi Hills, though such situations may occur among newly married couples before they have children. Gurdon, who wrote his book *The Khasis* in 1914, states:

"Amongst the Khasis, after one or two children are born, and if a married couple get on well together, the husband frequently removes his wife and family to a house she and her husband post their marriage, which are expended for the support of the family" (p. 76).

In the Khasi Hills, the transition period between matrilocal residence and neolocal or virilocal residence seems to have been shortened during the last forty or fifty years. This might have been effected through the influence of Christian marriages, which start cohabitation of the wife and the husband immediately after the marriage ceremony. However, in Jaintiapa whose inhabitants originated in the Jaintia Hills where duolocal marriage is the usual practice, there are even now many instances of a man staying at his mother's house for several

19. Nakane K-5 (1953-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7

years after his marriage. During this period he works in his wife's field, then, if the couple gets on well, they start to live together in an independent house (non-heiress's case) or in the wife's house (heiress's case). In spite of the fact that the inhabitants are all Christians, they have retained this custom.

It is difficult to determine at what date the Khasi people have changed from duolocal marriage to uxorilocal marriage. However, the present dwelling unit, with its fluid relationship between husband and wife (in fact, there are many cases of category 3), suggests a structure linked with the duolocal residence pattern. The fragmentary historical information available and the present Khasi residence pattern suggest that the duolocal arrangement may be an older pattern of marriage. When I was in Kongton there was no husband who stayed at his mother's house permanently, visiting his wife at night. The local man told me that, when he married, there were many who did not stay in the wife's house. He was the first person to settle in the wife's house. In his case, he said, he felt sympathy for his wife who had no brother who could work for her. After he had settled in his wife's house, many villagers began to follow his example.[1] When the pattern of a visiting marriage was in vogue, a village must have constituted a more compact endogamous unit. If the husband's house was in another village, a visiting marriage must have been a great inconvenience. The tendency to settle in the wife's house and work for the wife's house must have brought about a wider range of marriage contracts, such as with members of nearby villages, even though in the present form of marriage, village endogamy is much preferred as it is decidedly advantageous particularly for a husband, since he can continue his life in the same familiar environment in spite of uxorilocal marriage.

The variations in the pattern of co-residential grouping, which I have classified into four categories, reflect two different themes in the social structure of the Khasi. On the one hand they represent different stages in the maturity of the individual families concerned. For example, a householder who starts in category 3 or 4 may end as an old man in category 1. On the other hand these variations also reflect the polar opposition between the obligations of matrilineal kinship and the obligations of parenthood; a man, in particular, has conflicting obligations towards the *ring* of his sister and the *ring* of

1. However, all the information which I collected in the upland Khasi Hills indicates that the uxorilocal residence pattern has been practised for a long time. According to stories often told by the Kongton people, they migrated from the Jaintia Hills. If these accounts are to be taken as a reflection of the real history of their migration, it would seem that the Kongton people may have kept up the Jaintia custom including the duolocal residence pattern up to recent times, while the majority of the Khasi practised uxorilocal marriage.

19: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 ART Khasi ART

his wife. Paternal rights are not well recognized among the Khasi. The religious elements in the *sing* institution lay stress only on matrilineal solidarity. These elements tend therefore to orient each individual of the domestic unit to his or her own matrilineal kin group, the *sing*. This results in unstable relations between members of each elementary family, in other words, the marriage relation is one of the weakest.

This is the crucial point in matrilineal societies, and has been much discussed by anthropologists. Richards says,

> "In this balance of privileges and duties between the parties and the matrilineal the crucial point is obviously the husband's right to determine the residence of the bride. If she and her children live in the same homestead or village as his kinsmen, his domestic authority is likely to be greater than when they remain with the wife's relatives" (Richards, *supra*, p. xvii).

This statement is quite acceptable for those matrilineal systems which provide possibility for a man to take his wife from her matrilineal to his home or village where the husband's kin are found, as in cases of the matrilineal Central Bantus, the Ashanti, the Trobriands and the Nayar in North Malabar. However, among the Khasi, there is no such custom of removing a wife from her kin to that of her husband. Since most marriages take place inside a village, there are only two different residential arrangements: one is to take the husband to the wife's house, where he lives with his wife's parents and other matrilineal, the second is for the newly married couple to establish an independent house. Among Khasi men and women the usual practice is to leave the parents' house at marriage, except in the case of the heiress (the youngest daughter). In this respect the Khasi differ again from the Nayar and the Minangkabau who form a sibling family on the basis of duolocal residence,[1] and from the Hopi, the Zuni and the Trobriand who form a residential group of an extended family, based on matrilineal descent including in-marrying husbands of married females. Khasi sisters do not form a residential group after their marriage; sisters' houses are scattered over the whole village residential area, mixing with households of other descent groups (see Fig. 11, with List 8).

Then, what is the factor that makes the Khasi have two different types of residence i.e. uxorilocal and neolocal[2] within a matrilineal

1. Only the case of some traditional Javanese instances it would appear to show groupings similar to those of the Nayar, however. Did not work among them, nor are there anthropological reports available for them, particularly in this respect.

2. I use 'neolocal' in terms of house-building since they usually build a house for newly married couple in the same village where both wife's and husband's parents live—village endogamy.

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7

society? Among the matrilineal Central Bantus, Richards says that the determining factor in residence at marriage is the marriage payment or the type of goods and services which the bridegroom gives (Richards, 1950, p. 249). However, the Khasi have no such custom in the marriage contract, it is therefore out of the question to explain the two types of residence in this way. In the case of the Khasi, the determining factor is the type of marriage with relation to the rule of inheritance and ownership of property, which is closely related to the structure of the clan. Khasi marriages can be divided into two categories i.e., marriage with an heiress and with a non-heiress. Marriages with an heiress must be matrilocal. This accounts for category 1 or 3 of the household pattern. On the other hand, marriages with a non-heiress become neolocal and correspond to category 4 of the household unit.

IV. Marriage with an Heiress

A man married to an heiress, usually lives with his wife's parents and her unmarried or divorced brothers and sisters. For a man, life after marriage under such circumstances require great adjustment and endurance. The husband's status is especially weak when a male member of the wife's kin lives in the same household. The management of property and all economic activities are entirely controlled by the authority (wife's brother or maternal uncle) of the clan. The husband works in the wife's field under constant supervision from this authority. Both economic activities and domestic affairs are always under the management of this authority. The children have more attachment to, and are more obedient to, the maternal uncle than to the father. The tie between the uncle and the nephew is so strong that the father is rather like an additional member of the household. He is the last person to be introduced to visitors.

This family system is closely reflected in the daily behaviour. When we visited the Khasi household of a youngest daughter, if a man (obviously the husband) came first to greet us, he always said "please wait, my wife (or mother-in-law) is coming." And it was the wife who entertained us, offering tea or pan and discussing matters with us, while her husband remained silent in the corner of the room, or in the next room. If her uncle or brother was there, he would be the person who talked to us, while his niece or sister served us. In such a case, we were seldom introduced to the husband. When I was working at Shella, I happened to stay in such a family. I had hardly any opportunity to talk to the husband during the two weeks of my stay. He left the house very early in the morning and came back late in the evening from the fields. While he was at home, he was

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7

always somewhat outside the family conversation which was centred on the maternal uncle and his sisters, nephews and nieces, by whom I was well taken care of. This is somewhat similar to the situation amongst the Cewa and the Yao of the Central Bantus, which have what Richard calls 'the detachable husband' (Richards, 1950, pp. 233-35, 246), though the parallel is not by any means exact.

There is, therefore, inevitably an element of tension in the relations between the wife's maternal uncle (including parents-in-law) and the husband (son-in-law) and this tension makes the latter's life extremely uncomfortable. This awkward position is well shown in the divorce rate. At Kongtan (see List 9), out of 61 couples (house-owners and their spouses), the number of persons who had experience of divorce was 33 (female 15, male 18) and those married more than twice numbered 19 (female 7, male 12). Out of 61 couples, there were only 31 in which neither husband nor wife had been divorced. In my census of Jaitinga village, 70 per cent of all divorce cases were marriages to heiresses. In general, the period when divorce occurs more frequently is before a couple get children and after the wife has passed the child-bearing age. A marriage breaks up either through the action of the wife or of the husband, but generally through that of the wife. However, the state of separation which I presently describe is brought about by the husband, though later it results in a divorce from the wife. Divorce does not mean a great catastrophe for a Khasi wife, especially if she is an heiress and her husband's economic contribution is not significant. Moreover, in this society remarriage is as easy for a widow or divorcée, as it is to divorce. In the villages of Sohkynduh and Kongtan, the couple who wants to divorce has only to throw a few Assam together in the presence of some witness, usually an elderly man.

In addition to divorce, there are many actual separations of husband and wife, of short or long duration, when the husband runs away from his wife's house to his sister's. Though it does not always end in divorce, considerable number of husbands have a strong tendency to spend most of their time at their sister's house. Khasi women often said, me., "I, for," 'know why he does not come back to my place." I have often found the husband staying at his sister's house only a few houses away from his wife's, without any particular reason. They are obliged to see each other every day whether divorced or separated. This kind of ambiguity in the marriage relation seems to have an important correlation with the Khasi social structure, combined with the village endogamy. The man and and wife have grown up together from their childhood in the same village and known each other very well. Hence their psychology cannot clearly distinguish the marriage form as a newly-established independent social relation-

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7

ship. They still live in the same familiar atmosphere as before their marriage. The implications of this ambiguity in the married state are considerable. Particularly the husband's uncomfortable situation, when the wife is heiress, encourages him to take marriage less seriously.

A husband who undergoes hardship in his wife's house, finds himself as the authority in his sister's house; if he is not the authority, he can find at least a respected position as uncle or brother. In the case of a man of authority in the *iing*, the tendency for him to regard his *iing* as more important than his married life is proportionately stronger, as I will discuss later. Hence the most unstable and unsuccessful marriages are those between the heiress and the man of authority. This is one of the reasons we often find among the Khasi a brother or an uncle, who is already married, acting nevertheless as the head to a family *(iing)* and as a member of its domestic group. This means that he is in a state of temporary separation or divorced. Among the Ashanti, a man and his wife's broth r are never found as members of a common household (Forten, 1950, p. 260), but among the Khasi, on the contrary, a man and his wife's brother are often found as members of a common household. In such cases, however, the brother has no wife, or never brings his wife to his *iing*. Therefore, a man and his wife and his sister never reside together. As far as the residence of women is concerned, the Khasi keep to the strict descent rule; two women who belong to different descent groups never live together. This point differentiates the Khasi residence pattern, in which social structure is involved, from that not only of the Ashanti but also of the Yao where the head of a descent group can bring his wife to his sister's household, though, among other members, exogamous marriage is the rule. These differential aspects of matrilineal systems will be discussed from a more theoretical point of view later.

In addition, should a Khasi man even succeed in spending his life with his wife's kinsmen, as soon as the wife dies, he will usually return to his *iing*, that is, to his sister's house, where he is received warmly and where he often acts as the *de facto* authority, as in the similar situation of divorce and separation. Thus the strong matrilineal structural principle tends to orient a man towards his own descent group, the *iing*.

The man's attachment to his *iing* is very great throughout his life. In this regard the Khasi differs from the matrilineal Negri Sembilan Malay. Among the latter, returning to the matrilineal kin is regarded by the man as an imposition rather than as the enjoyment of a legitimate privilege (see Swift, 1958, p. 157).[1] This difference

1. He presents this fact as one of the reasons of the durability of marriage among the Negri Sembilan. Indeed, on this precise point they differ from the Khasi where marriage is rather unstable.

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7

171 seems to come *firstly* from the different residential arrangement on
• 592 marriage: among the Negri Sembilan a man marries into his wife's
602 group, i.e. his wife's village; being thus separated from his kin, and
619 as a result of the physical absence of his wife's brother or maternal
428 uncle in his domestic family, he enjoys considerable rights in his wife's household—as Swift states, he is 'master in his own house.' On the other hand, since among the Khasi the man stays in the village where his mother's (or mother's successor's) house is, even after his marriage, his relation to his natal house is preserved; *secondly*, from the structural difference of organization of the descent group. Among the Khasi, the *sing* is always the centre of the descent group, based on uniginiture succession and inheritance. Hence, the core of the descent group is always found physically in a particular household, whereas among the Negri Sembilan, the descent group is *not* organized on a *household* level, but in a much wider organization, including apparently many households. Membership of an actual household and of a descent group are at different levels. To marry out and become a member of his wife's household means for the man the transfer of his household membership. Likewise, his sister's husband becomes a member of his sister's household. Thereby he becomes a secondary member of his sister's household after marriage though he keeps his membership in the descent group to which his sister belongs. Among the Khasi, membership of a descent group always corresponds to membership of a particular household. The Khasi man can always demand his rights at his natal house primarily, as he is a member of that descent group. But it should be noted that he has this right only in his mother's (or mother's successor's) household, not his other sisters' (non-heiress') and mother's sisters' households (unless one of them is successor of his mother), though they may belong to the same descent group. These matri kin's households are considered as separate *sing* (strict functional descent group) from his.

586 Indeed, sometimes a man cannot find his *sing*, because his mother
619 died leaving no daughter to succeed her, or his sister died leaving
716 no successor, and his *sing* became extinct. Such a case occasionally
428 happens when a man becomes a divorcé or a widower as he is getting old. *Then he has to face a serious social and economic condition. In* divorcing, he has to leave everything he owned, his earnings including the house which he built, and even children . . . really he has nothing left him except his body.[1] Such a wretched man collects some timber and makes a small hut for himself, though sometimes lads who sympathize with him help him to build it. Unless he finds some woman

1. A widower has an alternative solution—to remain in his late wife's household till he marries again, though his position is not comfortable there.

15: Nakne E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7

whom he can marry, he has to endure this miserable lonely life, while often in he same village his former wife is living in a well-built house with herchildren and her matrilineal relatives as before. Households of 3, 13 and 30 of Sohkynduh in List 6, and 23, 29, 38 and 56 of Kongton in List 5 are instances of such cases. It is really a pitiful picture to see such a man, aged and poor, living all alone.

586 619 716 428

V. Marriage with the Non-heiress

Outsiders who come to the Khasi Hills are often impressed by the Khasi husband's miserable status and express surprise at the high divorce rate. This is mostly due to exaggeration based on the marriage with the heiress. However, where a man marries a non-heiress, there are many successful marriages with paternal authority. In most of these cases a man's status as a husband and as a father is stable. First of all, the domestic residential unit is an elementary family. From the start of the marriage the husband's labour is of great importance to his family, since a non-heiress usually has no economic background, i.e., no dowry or inherited property (see p. 125). The economic circumstances allow a man to be the *de facto* head even though whatever he earns belongs, as a rule, to his wife. A man who succeeds at the beginning of his married life is respected and honoured as father of his family for the rest of his life. By this type of marriage, the man's status is firmly established. It is therefore a more secure form of marriage than a match with an heiress.

184 428 599

In such a marriage the children love and obey their father. The management of his acquired property will be taken over by his son and the property will be handed over to his daughter. Thus the paternal authority is as well established in this form of domestic family, as in a patrilineal family. However, the great difference from a patrilineal case is that the husband/father status is not permanent as the authority of the family. Theoretically he exercises it in the absence of a male adult member of his wife's *siang* (actually bounded by his contribution), in other words, till his son is grown up (see p. 11). In the next generation this will form an established *siang* in which the husband of his youngest daughter will suffer again.

[615]

The household of this kind of marriage with a non-heiress actually enjoys a considerable degree of independence from the descent groups of both wife and husband. If a man who has established a matrimonial life independent of his wife's natal *siang*, is not the authority of his natal *siang*, his relation with the latter usually becomes weaker. Economic and residential factors make it possible for the man to make the considerable shift from his *siang* to his wife's *siang*, and through

592 • 593 615

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7

592 593 613 he clearly maintains the label of his descent group, he is at least divorced from them economically. If a father's activities were such as to permit the accumulation of wealth to be handed over to the next generation, he is always remembered with great respect and admiration by his successors and by the descendants of his wife's matrilineal line. In such a case he is looked upon as a member of his wife's descent group rather than of his mother's descent group. The best examples of this are the cases of men belonging to the first generation of Jaitinga villagers, especially that of the founder of Jaitinga. These immigrants to Jaitinga mostly accompanied their wives, who were not heiresses (as I mentioned previously, the unit of Khasi immigrants is mostly found in this kind of a couple); and most of them established successful matrimonial life with paternal authority, having been freed from the gravity of both matri-kin of wife as well as of husband.

[166]

Not necessarily confined to such cases of immigrants, even in an ordinary situation, if husband is ready to devote himself for his wife and children, the matrimonial life mostly turns happier and well established one. For under the Khasi matrilineal system, a wife, if she is not the heiress, is normally oriented to develop surprisingly high degree of independence from her descent group, i.e. her natal *sing*, unlike women of other matrilineal societies. This fact is closely related with the unique structure of the *sing*, as already discussed.

As a woman (non-heiress) tends to keep a certain distance to her natal *sing*, her brother accordingly decreases his concern to her new household. The pressure of the authority (wife's maternal uncle or brother) of wife's natal *sing*, on such a household becomes less marked. The wife's brothers are members of her natal *sing*, out of her new established *sing*, and therefore none of them can act as an authority over her new *sing*, though they may exercise certain pressure on the sister's husband, since the sister who established the new *sing* still keeps her membership in her natal *sing*. In fact a husband actually feels pressure from his wife's brothers; the occasional visits of the authority of her natal *sing* exercise a psychological check on his whole control over her and his children. Should any serious misfortune occur in the marriage, the wife will run to her brother for consultation. Furthermore, as member of her natal *sing*, he has the right to demand the property acquired by him if his wife has no successor, since it automatically belongs to his wife unless he acquired it without cohabitation with her, or through the capital of his *sing*. However, the process of segmentation in the *sing* leads the wife to greater attachment to her husband, particularly when his economic contribution is important, and as a consequence weakens her ties with her natal *sing*.

613 The limited rights of the brother over his sister's (non-heiress)

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7

brother (actually not likely to happen), the levirate has no sociological implication in the social structure, which is specifically related to the residence rule. The levirate seems to have a significant function only when a marriage is virilocal—when the husband has full rights over his residence and property. This is also another aspect where the Khasi structure shows a marked difference from that of the Ashanti and the Ila, etc.

VI. Marriage of the Man of Authority of an *Iing*

Among these successful marital families, there are also shadows of a matrilineal order. These affect especially those men who are in the position of authority in an *iing*. Such a man, though he has an independent household with his wife and children, often visits his youngest sister's (or niece's) house, *iing (ha iing ane)*, and sometimes stays there. Such a man's attachment to his *iing* is not only social or psychological, but also often economic. The man, as authority of his natal *iing*, usually has economic control over the management, particularly so, if his *iing* has considerable property or active trading business. As husband/father in his family he works for his wife and children, but often takes into consideration as well the interests of his *iing*. I found such cases especially among richer villagers in Mollia and Jaitinga, where the main economic activities were based on trading.

Among the Khasi, it is quite a traditional rule of the division of labour that women engage in trading activities at markets whether on a large or small scale. Husbands may carry goods from field to market, but male members are kept away from the actual scene of the selling and buying. However, these activities on the part of the women are controlled and accounted for by their uncle or brother, or even son (or, if no male member is available, by the husband), though in many cases they form separate domestic families. The man's control over the trade appears more marked when the scale of business is large.

A man of Jaitinga, who worked in a shop in Haflong, spent his salary in keeping his wife and children, but at the same time he kept the accounts of his sister who was a professional merchant. Thus, the economy of the *iing* and that of the co-residential group are crossed by the dual role of the man. Hence, among the Khasi, residential autonomy is not always an indication of economic autonomy. However, it should be clearly understood that a man's acquired property goes to his co-residential group, not to his *iing*.

A man of authority is attached to his *iing* by the stronger ties of religious, social and economic (management) duties as well as by

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7

592 593 602 613 [123]

sentiment, in spite of his forming an independent domestic unit. Such a man with two households, the family of orientation and of procreation, says "one leg is in my sister's house and the other is in my wife's," and he feels more at home in his sister's. In villages, whenever a Khasi man in such a position invited me, I was always taken to his sister's (or niece's) house, his *iing*, not to his wife's. There I was warmly welcomed with highest respect by the women of the household as the guest of their uncle (or of their brother), the head of the *iing*. Khasi men whom outsiders often regard as hopeless in their social position, thus enjoy the highest status in their *iing*.

One Khasi gentleman who occupies a fairly high post in the Government, at Haflong, leaving his wife (non-heiress) and children at Shillong, to my question "when you go to Shillong into which house do you first step," immediately replied, "As soon as I get back to Shillong, I take the way to my sister's home and there take the evening meal with them, enjoying their talk. Then I go to my wife's house where my loving children are waiting." This shows a typical Khasi man's psychology in relation to a family of orientation and of procreation. His first concern on coming back to his homeland is whether his sister and her children are well, since he is the man of authority in that *iing*. He feels much more relaxed in his sister's house where he is held in higher regard and more cared for.

I came across many similar cases. In Jaitings and Shella, such men on returning from their work, often have their evening meal with their sisters though their wives are waiting for them. Furthermore, if they choose to do so, they sleep at their sister's house without even going back to their wife's house. This results in an unstable married life, where a wife has to face a psychological handicap caused by the occasional absence of the husband, in spite of her advantageous position in a matrilineal and matrilocal system. Many wives worry every day over whether or not their husbands will come to their house at night. And often this concern changes into sadness and loneliness when the husband does not return for several days on end. The wife knows her husband is at his sister's house in the same village. But she has no right to fetch her husband home. As in Western social dancing, the women have to wait till their partners come. During my field work I often came across these lonely women, just waiting for their husbands, each knowing he was only a few houses away. Though these Khasi women never show their feelings of loneliness in the presence of others, I, being a female anthropologist, was often told of the sadness of their married life. The situation of these women can be more easily understood if we remember the process of the segmentation of the *iing*, which separates each married woman from her descent group, her natal *iing*.

[123]

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7 •
Garo AR5

The Nayar type: The counter scheme of the Garo type: the co-residential type is 'brother-sister' instead of 'husband-wife.' The function of both line *A* and *B* is equally strong. This type is found among the traditional Nayar (except those in North Malabar) and the Minangkabau matrilineal people.

The Khasi type: The ideal co-residential type consists of a woman with either her husband or her brother. The function of line *A* is much stronger than that of line *B*. This type is found among the Khasi, the Hopi, the Zuni, the Trukese, the Negri-Sembilan Malay, the Yao, etc.

The Ashanti type: The ideal co-residential type consists of a man with either his wife or his sister. The function of line *B* is much stronger than that of line *A*. This type is found among the Ashanti, the Gwembe Tonga, the Mayombe, the Trobriands, the Nayar of North Malabar, etc.

In terms of the strong function of both lines *A* and *B*, both the Garo type and the Nayar type may fall into a similar category. But as already explained, their structure basically differs from one another, and clearly appears as the counter schemes of different residential arrangements. The Nayar type shares with the Khasi a rather similar structure in terms of a descent group equated with a property group, while in the Garo type the two lines *A* and *B* of a single descent group never form an independent property unit.

If, leaving aside the Garo type, we consider the three others, the Nayar type appears again different from the rest in so far as in it, both lines fulfill an equally strong function, while in the Khasi and Ashanti types, one of the two lines is always more developed functionally than the other. The Nayar type presents the highest degree of descent group solidarity among the three. This Nayar situation might be compared with that of the traditional Chinese patrilineal systems.[1] In both social systems the structural importance of marriage is minimized: the role of a spouse is only to ensure descendants of the matrilineal (patrilineal) group. The structural importance of a husband (wife) is almost neglected, while the wife (husband) holds the paramount locus in her (his) descent line. The descent group manifests the strongest solidarity within itself, neglecting affinal relations with other groups. This principle results in the custom of the "visiting husband" in the matrilineal system; and in the patrilineal system, in a total social shift of the wife by her complete assimilation into her husband's group, and separation from her descent group,—she has no social and personal independent locus in terms of the structure. It is an interesting fact that the most extreme scheme of highly institutionalized unilineal systems can be seen among societies of pre-industrialized high civilization. These schemes are structurally opposed to those of the system of the society

1. Fortes touches this point in his paper (Fortes, 1959, p. 206).

15: Nakane E-5 (1955 1956) 1967 AR? Khasi AR?
Garo AR5

lineage is a corporate unilineal descent group of which the members can establish demonstrable genealogical relationships to each other. According to Firth, "lineage is essentially a unilineal descent group with some corporate functions, normally related by segmentary process to other descent groups of the same type, and with them usually covering the entire society" (1957, p. 4). The Garo and the Khasi can then be said to have the lineage, but to lack its segmentary organization which normally is found in a unilineal society. Both social structures exemplify the importance of the residence as a functional unit, against the wider descent group which may be called the lineage group.

In the case of the Garo, the localized lineage is expressed in terms of the village (or group of villages) whose land bears the name of the localized lineage. However, it is the village which acts as the functional corporate body, the economic and ritual unit, not the group of members of the localized lineage. The village theoretically consists of the members of the two localized lineages, as represented in the headman and his wife respectively. Practically, though it bears the name of a particular lineage to which the wife of the headman belongs, as also usually the majority of the inhabitants, it includes many other lineage members as well as the traditional two lineages. Therefore, the lineage is not, in this sense, an exclusive corporate unit with a ritual and economic function, though it has a theoretical framework to the structure.

In the case of the Khasi, the lineage is found only on a household scale, centred in the woman, the property owner with members having direct matrilineal kinship ties to the former, such as her brothers, elder sisters, sons and daughters, who may or may not reside in the same household—the members of the *iing*. Beyond this unit (the *iing*) one can hardly find any functional organization based on the descent system. In other words, the lineage becomes a functional unit only at the level of the household, e.g., the lowest level of segmentation of the descent group, and it lacks wider external organization by the same principle. The lineage is considered rather as a ritual conception implying exogamy, not as an organized body of kin.

These phenomena contrast sharply with the Hopi and the Ashanti social organization, where lineage organization has crucial importance wider than on a household level. Many factors can be considered in this connection. First of all, the locus of property and ceremonial unit are the most distinctive features. Among the Khasi, property and ceremonial units are always found in an *iing*, represented by the youngest daughter's household, while that of the Hopi and the Ashanti are in a wider lineage organization in which members of many households are usually included. The Zuni pattern seems also similar to that of the Khasi. The difference between the Khasi and Zuni lies

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7 •
Garo AR5

K
9
171
182
• 592
613

in the rule of inheritance; the former follows uxoripotrous (ultimogeniture), while the latter does not. Therefore, the number of members of a *Zuni* household is naturally larger than that of the Khasi.[1] Against the average number of a Khasi household, four to five, that of the *Zuni* is seven and a half to eight persons (Kroeber, 1917, p. 104). Among the Khasi, sisters separate through marriage in every generation, leaving the youngest in their natal home; while *Zuni* sisters may stay together even after their marriages. Kroeber states:

> "The house belongs to the women born of the family. They come into the world, pass their lives, and within the walls they die . . . Now and then a new dwelling may be built by all the females, or for a girl of the house by an enterprising husband; but in general the same walls, or repaired ones on the same spot (*ibid.*, pp. 47-48). . . . It is true that a *Zuni* 'house' often contains what we should regard as two or three households, but so long as it includes only one unit hearth, and all natives count that the two or three households are a single one" (*ibid.*, p. 104).

The internal composition of the household may differ from that of the Khasi, but the household in terms of the important institutionalized unit, is very similar to the Khasi. Li An-che states that "characteristics of a joint household based on the kinship principle stand out very strikingly" (Li, 1937, p. 75). Eggan's statement brings *Zuni* social organization much closer to the issue. He writes, "In terms of Kroeber's table it would seem that the *Zuni* tend to equate a lineage with a household, except in cases of recent expansion or building off" (Eggan, 1950, p. 189). He gives a further illuminating analysis of this point:

> "We have noted that the lineage principle, . . . also provides a mechanism for the inheritance of ceremonial duties and obligations and the transmission and preservation of fetishes and other ceremonial paraphernalia. In *Zuni* this inheritance is phrased in terms of the household, but it is clear that it is the lineage segment born into the household that is important. This lineage segment, or at least the female line thereof, also owns land and holds it in trust for succeeding generations, to be worked by the men who marry into the household" (*ibid.*, p. 208).

Another similar equation of lineage and household, comparable to that of the Khasi and the *Zuni*, is found among the Trukese. According to Goodenough (1951):

[1] This involves not only the difference of the number of members in a household but also the relation between the members of a descent group. As already discussed, the core of the descent group among the Khasi, is the pair of brothers: the owner of the property (the youngest sister) and the authority (a brother), not the sibling group altogether (see p. 150) as happens in other matrilineal systems appearing in this discussion. In regard to the uxoripotrous succession itself, the Garo share the same system as the Khasi, though it appears to operate differently by reason of the structural difference of organization.

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR? Khasi AR? •
Garo AR5

"In aboriginal times they used to be associated with most lineages a dwelling house, *ramo* (p. 93) . . . *ramo* is the corporate property of the lineage or descent line whose women live in it, but it is normally built by their husbands" (p. 98).

Here, it is clear that a household provides the major locus of a lineage. In other words, a lineage is a corporate property group with a common residence. This is also the case of the Nayar *tarwad* and the Minangkabau *parui*, though in these cases the household excludes the spouses of its members, while with the Khasi, the Zuni, and the Trobriand the spouses (in most cases, the husbands) share the residence.

Though they may differ in scale and size from one society to another, as well as from one household to another, the functional lineage founded upon residence has thus a similar range in all of these systems. For convenience sake, I tentatively term this type of lineage "household-lineage,"[1] as opposed to that of the Hopi and the Ashanti, which might be termed "segmentary-lineage."

The average number of Khasi and Garo household members is four to five, that of the Zuni seven and a half to eight as stated above, the Trobriand is eighteen (three to thirty-four in Kiriwina Island, according to Goodenough), while the Nayar range from thirty to two hundred. These differences, I think, mostly depend on the economic (and environmental) situation, they should not be regarded as structural, except for the Garo and the Khasi, which, because of the uxorilocal rule, have smaller and fairly uniform households. The wide range of variation in composition which we observe among the Trobriand and the Nayar is due in reality to economic and environmental factors the more favorable the circumstances, the larger the unit.

The co-residential group and the property unit do not always concurrently correspond. One property group may consist of more than two independent residences. But even in such cases, the lineage is likely to be found in a group which formed a co-residential unit in the recent past, and which should be considered as marginal cases, derived from the recent fusion of a group—it is a lineage in process of fission not a constant kin-group based on other organization such as we find among the Ashanti and the Hopi. Usually such a lineage ceases to function shortly after it loses its common property, which usually follows closely upon the fission of the residential unit. Thus, in the course of time a once-recognized lineage group disappears into the common sea of the clan, which represents only a ritual and exogamous unit. In some cases, even this clan loses its function, as happens among the Nayar and the Minangkabau, where the lineage which

1. It should be noted that it does not mean that the lineage consists of household members, but that the lineage solidarity is found around the range of a household scale.

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR? Khasi AR? •
Garo AR5

corresponds (or corresponded in the near past) to the co-residential property-group itself becomes an exogamic unit, disrupting the wider unit of the clan. Structurally it can be said that in these societies a lineage cannot exercise its full function unless it has a common residence based on a property unit.

In contrast to these societies, I cannot help but think that the Ashanti and the Hopi belong to a different type. Both Fortes and Eggan lay great emphasis on the descent principle, based on the ethnographic data of the Ashanti and of the Hopi respectively. The best examples of statements concerning this issue are the accounts in which both stress their disagreement with Kroeber's argument of 1938 in favour of the priority of local residence relationships over those of descent, under the title of "Basic and secondary patterns of social structure."

Fortes states:

"A lineage cannot easily act as a corporate group if its members can never get together for the conduct of their affairs. It is not surprising therefore to find that the lineage in African societies is generally locally anchored, but it is not necessarily territorially compact or exclusive. A compact nucleus may be enough to act as the local centre for a group that is widely dispersed. I think it would be agreed that lineage and locality are independently variable and how they interact depends on other factors in the social structure. As I interpret the evidence, local ties are of secondary significance, pace Kroeber, for local ties do not appear to give rise to structural bonds in and of themselves. There must be common political or kinship or economic or ritual interests for structural bonds to emerge. Again spatial dispersion does not immediately put an end to lineage ties or to the ramifying ties one found in agnatic systems like that of the Lozi. For legal status, property, office and cult act reciprocally to hold dispersed lineages together and scattered kindred" (Fortes, 1953, p. 26).

Eggan states:

"For the Hopi the kinship structure is centered primarily around the lineage; the household relationships are secondary (Eggan, 1950, p. 113) . . .

"Furthermore, it is the lineage and clan, rather than the household group, which is invested with lands and ceremonies and which is considered to own the house itself. Important as are the ties of residence and subsistence association, they are not the key groupings in Hopi communities—nor in terms of our interpretation.

"Kroeber explicitly leaves kinship out of account in his analysis of 'basic and secondary patterns of social structure,' but in a sense kinship is more fundamental than either patterns of residence or formal grouping. Our analysis of Hopi kinship has suggested that both the household and the lineage organizations are encompassed in the kinship system. And it is clear that the kinship system is organized in terms of the lineage principle rather than in terms of residence" (*ibid.*, p. 139).

These arguments seem to me to refer more to a difference of social organization than to a theoretical contrast. On the basis of my own

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7 •
Garo AR5

field work as well as on the accounts of various matrilineal systems. I feel strongly that there must be different types of systems which may be distinguished as "household-lineage" and "segmentary-lineage". Fortes and Eggan postulate the pre-eminence of the descent principle over residence. Though this may be the case among the Ashanti and the Hopi, it does not fit the cases belonging to what I call "household-lineage" type. Firth's argument emphasizing the importance of rights to group membership being associated with locality, fits very well with the latter case. With more precision and subtlety than Kroeber, he argues that "residence by itself does not give title to descent-group membership, but land rights established by descent-group membership tend to remain operational only through residence" (Firth 1957, p. 7).

I believe there are crucial differences between these household-lineage type and segmentary-lineage type organizations. The technical process of fission into segments is similar in both types. But in the former, once a segmented group attains autonomy, the relation between the segments will easily be forgotten after a few generations, as it has no significant social implication. Among these societies, people's genealogical memory outside the residential group is surprisingly poor. This empirical fact also suggests a different structure from that of the segmentary system.

In both types of society the internal organization of a household is the same, but it differs externally. Eggan states that "Kroeber's and Parsons' statements about the lack of system in regard to Zuni kinship indicate judgement from some arbitrary standard" and adds "The concept of the lineage provides a bridge between the household and the clan" (Eggan, *ibid.*, p. 197). I cannot agree with this. In fact, my study of the Garo, the Khasi and the Nayar corresponds very well to the Zuni situation described by Kroeber and Parsons. There are matrilineal systems which lack a bridge between the household and the clan.

Then what is it that makes the difference between the two types of organization in similar unilineal systems? I am not sure that I can produce at present effective hypotheses on this issue. Moreover, empirical facts show that the household-lineage type organization is likely to be found among more complicated societies or in a society with considerable mobility. This we gather also if we compare the village compositions of the Hopi and the Zuni. In the case of the Khasi, we saw that there was considerable mobility in population even in remote villages, so that we easily understand that in such a condition lineage membership hardly maintained itself. This seems to agree with the view put forth by Fortes on segmentary systems. Fortes says the limits of the spread or span of internal segmentation of the

15: Nakane E-5 (1955-1956) 1967 AR7 Khasi AR7

000 Such variety in residential arrangements and such flexibility in inheritance rule complicates considerably the composition of the residential unit when a property group (residential domestic unit) grows. Richards gives an interesting illustrative description of the formation of a Bemba residential unit:

> "The Bemba bridegroom starts his married life as a stranger in his wife's village, but since his daughters remain with him for some years after marriage he builds up a grand-family composed of his daughters, their husbands, and their children. In some cases he is able to persuade his sons-in-law to remain permanently with him, while in others he is even able to keep his sons in his own village. In time some of his sister's sons, with their wives, will choose to come and settle with him, so that he will be head of a group of rather heterogeneous composition" (Richards, *ibid.*, p. 227).

Here we find a man's wife's matrilineal kin (his daughters and sons, including the daughters' descendants); his own matrilineal kin (his sisters' sons); and the third matrilineal sets (his sons' wives and his sister's sons'wives). Such a mixed composition of a residential unit may never be found among societies belonging to those types previously discussed; such residential composition would be impossible if the matrilineal principle was functioning strongly in the structure of the actual property group.

Thus, the Bemba type presents an outstanding structural difference from the other types of matrilineal systems in which the matrilineal inheritance rule was the decisive factor for the formation of the residence unit. It is clear that in the Bemba type, both a man and a woman are fairly free from the economic control of his and her matri- 171
lineal group, and their relations are somewhat like those of the husband 182
of the Khasi type and the wife of the Ashanti type. Therefore, the • 592
conflicts between one's matrilineal group and family of procreation 611
are minimized, particularly in the economic sphere.

This analysis throws much light on the following remarks of Richards bearing on different aspects of the similar formation of descent groups among the Yao and the Bemba.

> "The head of a Yao village of this sort (taking his wife to his matrilineage residence) thus has authority over his wife's children and over those of his sisters, but the position of the wife's children seems to be clearly differentiated from that of the sister's children, and Mitchell speaks of a traditional hostility between them. I never saw evidence of such hostility in Bemba villages, which also often contain a man's children and his sister's children" (Richards, *ibid.*, p. 235).

This difference should really be ascribed to the structural difference between the Khasi type (the Yao) and the Bemba type. In the former the matrilineal structural force is strongly functioning in the residential group, whereas in the latter it is minimized.

197 people remained non-Hindu in their basic beliefs and social customs. Hindu
648 influences are nevertheless predominant in their culture, especially in their way
991 of living which shows a practical adaptability, somewhat similar to the Japanese
995 acceptance of modern western culture without becoming Christian. In my
[797] census of Shella village, the people calling themselves 'Hindu' amount to 40 per
[162] cent of the total, but they are the recent converts to the Ramakrishna School which established a missionary station at Shella after the Partition. The Christians constitute 30 per cent of the total, most of them having been converted during the last ten years, as in the case of the Ramakrishna School.[1] The rest remain as they were, of Khasi belief. These conversions to either
[455] Ramakrishna or Christianity seem to have been encouraged by the unstable situation of the people resulting from the recent economic depression in this area.

439 The Partition of India and Pakistan in August 1947, which drew the bor-
458 derline a few miles south of Shella village, considerably upset village economy
648 by stopping all trade with Bengal, though a limited amount of trade is allowed with local people at the border. Because of this political change, all the produce of Shella gardens is rotting away for lack of markets, while all of the rice hitherto were taken by Pakistan. Goods now come to Shella only from the uplands, carried upon men's shoulders over the most difficult pass, which makes everything very expensive. Many families have sold their gold and other treasures, and some families are facing starvation.[2]

182 Concerning the conversion to a new religion, an interesting phenomenon
191 is to be observed. The conversion to Christianity or to Ramakrishna is mostly by individual. I found in my census that the wife and husband often belong to
• 592 different religions. This is a very different picture from the Garo, among whom
613 I always found that the husband and wife belonged to the same religion: the
991 conversion of the husband to Christianity was always followed by that of the wife. I think this reflects the structural differences which influence the actual
795 relationship between the husband and wife. Among these Khasi, instead of the husband and wife, the maternal uncle and his nephews and nieces are mostly of the same religion. The function of the sib, the most important social unit religious unit, thus appears also in the conversion to a new religion, stronger than that of a domestic unit.

[illegible]

648 The close economic and cultural contact of the Shella people and the Bengalee
771 is not matched by social contact. The essential barrier between the two peoples is the difference of religion which dominates the entire social order in each
563 society. Though these Khasi were important traders, richer than the neighbouring Hindu peasants, they were considered by the Hindu as outcasts with whom they never shared social activities. Intermarriages were therefore very rare. In Shella village, only two exceptional cases were found in my census:

1. A Khasi woman married to a Garo (cattle-keeper), they live at Shella Bazaar (Shella).
2. A Khasi woman has marital relation with a Bengalee medical doctor who has resided at Dkeng in Shella for six years. He already has a Bengalee

1. These two entirely different missionary activities are competing with each other, and are somewhat related to the political powers within this area.
2. The state government is doing its best to provide them with additional facilities for example, providing air transport for the transportation of oranges from Shella to Gauhati and Calcutta. However, such arrangements cannot cover the great economic loss suffered by the Shella people.

TABLE-XX

Classification of families by size of Building Occupied

Size of building occupied	Rural area				Urban area				General area			
	No. of families living	Average size of building per family (in sq.ft.)	No. of families having kutcha walls	Average age of building (in years)	No. of families living	Average size of building per family (in sq.ft.)	No. of families with kutcha walls	Average age of building (in years)	No. of families	Average size of building per family (in sq.ft.)	No. of families with kutcha walls	Average size of building (in years)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1 No shelter	200 (20.0)	—	—	—	80 (20.0)	—	—	—	280 (20.0)	—	—	—
2 Living from 1 room	0 (0.0)	0	0	0 (0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0)	0	0 (0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0)	0	0 (0)
3 Living from 2 rooms	170 (17.00)	170	60	7.00	130 (32.5)	170	130	10.0	300 (21.43)	170	70	8.50
4 3 or more rooms but not more than 10 rooms	830 (83.0)	470	140	9.00	270 (67.5)	470	80	9.00	1100 (78.57)	470	70	9.00
5 More than 10 rooms	0 (0.00)	0 (0)	0	0 (0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0)	0	0 (0)	0 (0.00)	0 (0)	0	0 (0)
Total no. of families possessing land	1000 (100.00)	640	200	8.50	400 (100.0)	640	210	9.50	1400 (100.00)	640	140	8.75
Grand Total	1000 (100.00)	640			400 (100.00)	640			1400 (100.00)	640		

LD: tocem G-2 (1954) 1963 487 Chavi 487

It is seen from the above table that proportion of landless labourers was quite high in Sundar area and Project area containing for 31 and 29 per cent of the total number of families in the respective area, against 19 in the General area. Considering holdings in general and classifying them as small holding (if they have 5 acres), medium holding (5 acres to less than 10 acres) and large holdings (10 acres and above), the proportion of families holding land in the three holding groups is found to be respectively 18 per cent, 19 per cent and 19 per cent in Sundar area, 27 per cent 14 per cent and 7 per cent in Project area and 39 per cent, 32 per cent and 8 per cent in General area.

Considering only the families holding land as will be evident from the data in the appendix in Sundar area the proportion of families in the three holding groups, i.e., small, medium and large are respectively 50%, 31% and 19% of the families holding land while for Project area they are 54%, 27% and 9% and for General area 59%, 29% and 12% respectively.

As to the area owned by the three holding groups in the Sundar area, Project area and General area, the small holding area respectively 9 per cent, 19 per cent and 21 per cent of the total agricultural land while medium holding area respectively 29 per cent, 30 per cent and 39 per cent, and the large holding area 62 per cent, 51 per cent and 39 per cent respectively. Thus in Sundar area 19 per cent of the families holding land own only 9 per cent of the total agricultural land in the village while in Project area 27 per cent of the families own 19 per cent of the land and in General area 29 per cent of the families own 21 per cent of total land. As a result the individual holdings under the small holding group are small measuring between 2.25 acres to 2.26 acres in Sundar area, 2.60 acres to 2.75 acres in Project area and 3.67 acres to 3.97 acres in General area. The average size of holdings per family in the small holding group in the Sundar area has consequently 2.26 acres, 3.67 acres and 3.97 acres as mentioned in the above, 6.15 acres and 3.12 acres in the medium holding group and 23.92 acres, 19.12 acres and 19.92 acres in large holding group. Average size of holding per family holding land in Sundar area, Project area and General area comes to respectively 9.09 acres, 5.09 acres and 5.15 acres. However excluding estimated labourers only as will be seen by Table III in the appendix, the above figures stand at 9.18 acres, 5.31 acres and 5.81 acres respectively considering the fact that a considerable portion of land is either left fallow or leased out to others.

The following table will throw light on the point

54

54.1 The total number of households in 687 holding in Kerala at one time is 3,543 giving an average of 5.16 households per holding. Of, in 661 holdings in project area is 3,480 which gives us the average 5.26 households per holding, while in Control area 143 holdings contribute of 683 households i.e. 5.00 households per holding. A comparison of the above figure with the average household figure of 5.87, 4.55, 6.65 and 5.45 per holding in Major Hills, Sloping, Midland and Lowlands districts respectively goes to show that incidence of tuberculosis in the district is higher than that in Major Hills but less than that in other districts.

54.2 It will be seen from table 54.1 or the appendix that in the small holding group (less than 5 acres) average number of households per holding is 1.90 in Kerala, 3.00 in Project and 3.40 in Control area. The average size in the corresponding holding group being 1.90 acres, 1.80 acres and 1.00 acres, in Kerala area, Project area and Control area. The average size of households in the respective area works out at 4.00 acres, 5.40 and 4.00 acres. Similarly it will be seen that the average size of households for medium holding group are, in Kerala area 1.61 acres (average size of medium holding 8.05 acres) in Project area 1.81 acres (average size of holding 9.05 acres) and in Control area 1.81 acres (average size of holding 8.00 acres), where the large holding group being 2.01 acres, 2.00 acres and 2.00 acres respectively, while the average large holding size of 10.05 acres, 10.00 acres, and 10.00 acres in the respective area.

Dwelling

54.3 The operating unit in the rural agricultural economy is in most cases the family farm. Farmsteads, cottages, animal and implement houses as regards to the agricultural practices in these farms are done through a joint effort of the family unit. Mostly agricultural farm operations are mechanised through employment of hired labourers are employed during the busy seasons.

54.4 In this respect a farm has been defined as comprising of all agricultural land operated by a single family with or without employment of labour. The family will as usual will have the right of possession enjoyment and alienation over the farm land operated by it, and in this case the farm is characterised from holding which comprises of such land and also right the family ownership includes right of occupancy and inheritance.

TABLE D.6

Distribution of farms according to size

6.6 The economic distribution of farms in the three areas is shown in the following table :—

Size of farm (in acres)	Surat area			Rajkot area			Ahmedabad area		
	No. of farms	Total area (acres)	Average size of farm (acres)	No. of farms	Total area (acres)	Average size of farm (acres)	No. of farms	Total area (acres)	Average size of farm (acres)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Below 5 acres	(1)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.2)	(0.1)	(0.5)	(1)	(0.5)	(0.5)
5 acres and below 10 acres	(3.5)	(3.1)	(0.9)	(1.1)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(1)	(0.8)	(0.8)
10 acres and below 20 acres	(6.1)	(4.2)	(0.7)	(7.8)	(5.1)	(0.7)	(2)	(1.1)	(0.6)
20 acres and below 30 acres	(10.1)	(11.2)	...	(14.1)	(15.6)	...	(14.3)	(15.6)	...
30 acres and below 40 acres	(7.1)	(9.1)	(1.3)	(7.1)	(9.1)	(1.3)	(3)	(4.1)	(1.4)
40 acres and below 50 acres	(4.2)	(4.9)	...	(4.1)	(4.8)	...	(4.1)	(5.1)	...
50 acres and above	(20)	(63.1)	(3.2)	(7)	(19.1)	(2.7)	(3)	(9.1)	(3.0)
	(14.7)	(4.2)	...	(1.2)	(0.1)	...	(1.1)	(1.2)	...
Total	(100.0)	(100.0)	3.9	(100.0)	(100.0)	2.0	(100.0)	(100.0)	2.0

00

CHAPTER IX

Income and Expenditure

9.1 The great majority of rural people are members of families of two or more persons sharing a common income earned mostly by joint efforts of family members as also disbursed in supplying the consumption needs of the family as a whole. An attempt is made below, therefore, to analyse the aspects of income and expenditure of the rural families family-wise.

9.2 It has already been mentioned that the majority (i.e., about 72 per cent) of the families of all the three areas pursued agriculture as a principal occupation. Some of these families follow cottage industries, trade, transport, labour, etc. as subsidiary occupations. The rest of the families had either agriculture as subsidiary occupation or were independent of agriculture. The large section of these families were non-agricultural labourers. The following table gives the distribution of families in different income groups.

TABLE C-1

Frequency distribution of families in different income groups

Income Group (Rs.)	No. of families											
	Station area				Project area				General area			
	Mainly agricultural	Non-agricultural	Total	Average annual gross income per family (Rs.)	Mainly agricultural	Non-agricultural	Total	Average annual gross income per family (Rs.)	Mainly agricultural	Non-agricultural	Total	Average annual gross income per family (Rs.)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1. Below 600	—	1 (.01)	1 (.00)	450.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2. 600 to below 900	2 (.02)	17 (1.71)	19 (0.97)	750.00	2 (1.42)	6 (3.85)	8 (3.21)	779.00	1 (.61)	—	1 (.44)	750.00
3. 900 to below 1200	108 (31.47)	17 (17.35)	125 (28.49)	1051.74	40 (28.48)	9 (5.77)	49 (19.67)	1047.04	19 (11.66)	5 (13.51)	24 (11.95)	1054.17
4. 1200 to below 1500	207 (60.47)	60 (61.22)	267 (60.82)	1351.44	100 (71.43)	87 (55.77)	187 (75.10)	1344.68	125 (76.69)	31 (83.78)	156 (77.61)	1350.00
5. 1500 to below 1800	26 (7.60)	21 (14.29)	47 (10.70)	1650.00	1 (.71)	53 (33.97)	54 (21.69)	1651.11	17 (10.43)	1 (2.70)	18 (8.96)	1650.00
6. 1800 to below 2100	1 (.29)	1 (.68)	2 (.46)	1950.00	1 (.71)	1 (.64)	2 (.80)	1950.00	1 (.61)	—	1 (.50)	1950.00
7. 2100 to below 2400	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
8. 2400 to below 2700	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9. 2700 to below 3000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10. 3000 and above	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	344 (100.00)	117 (100.00)	461 (100.00)	1,082.00	144 (100.00)	156 (100.00)	300 (100.00)	1,151.00	163 (100.00)	37 (100.00)	200 (100.00)	1,102.00

TABLE C-1—contd.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total ...	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

From table above, it is difficult to judge the relative prosperity of agricultural and non-agricultural families. The annual gross income of 69 per cent of the agricultural families is less than Rs.750-00 a year while that of 87 per cent of them is below Rs.1,000 a year. Thus the remaining 13 per cent of the families only have a gross annual income of above Rs.1,000 a year. Among non-agricultural families the corresponding proportions are 38 per cent, 78 per cent and 81 per cent. Thus proportion of non-agricultural families with annual gross income less than Rs.750, is greater than the corresponding proportion of agricultural families. The petty traders, porters and other non-agricultural labourers who are universally very poor constitute this non-agricultural class. On the other hand proportion of non-agricultural families with annual gross income of more than Rs.750 exceeds the corresponding proportion for agricultural families. These non-agricultural families comprise of a good number of business men, contractors, etc., who are comparatively a bit well off than the agriculturists.

In Project area proportion of agricultural families and non-agriculturist families with annual gross income of less than Rs.750 is 76 per cent and 29 per cent respectively as against 69 per cent and 38 per cent of their respective counterpart in Border area. Proportions of families with gross income below Rs.1,000 a year is 96 per cent and 86 per cent indicating that proportions of agricultural as well as non-agricultural families with income above Rs.1,000 a year are greater than their corresponding counterparts in Border area.

In general area villages it is significant to note that proportion of agricultural families with gross annual income of over Rs.2,000 is negligible (01 per cent) while those under Rs.750 and Rs.1,000 are 61 per cent and 87 per cent respectively.

Table below in Other records that 38 per cent of the gross income in the Border area, 34 per cent in the Project area and 38 per cent in the General area is earned by families in the income group Rs.2,000 contributing as much as 85 per cent of the total number of families in the respective areas.

TABLE G-2

Percentage distribution of income and families in different income groups

Annual income group (Rs.)	Border area		Project area		General area	
	Families	Income earned	Families	Income earned	Families	Income earned
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1. Less than 500	69.5	38.0	69.5	34.0	69.00	38.0
2. 500 to less than 1000	17.5	14.2	16.1	22.5	7.0	14.1
3. 1000 to less than 2000	5.1	6.7	5.8	9.5	...	...
4. 2000 and above	8.5	41.1	8.7	34.0	...	...
Total ...	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE G-8

Components of average annual gross income per family

Source of income	Agricultural families				Non-agricultural families				All families			
	Value of produce				Value of produce				Value of produce			
	Consumed at home	Marketed	Total	P.C.	Consumed at home	Marketed	Total	P.C.	Consumed at home	Marketed	Total	P.C.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Gross income—	Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.		Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.		Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.	
1. Agriculture and Animal husbandry												
2. Non-agricultural occupations—												
(a) Small scale manufacture and handicrafts												
(b) Trade												
(c) Transport												
3. Service, profession wages, etc.												
4. Exploitation of assets												
5. Miscellaneous												
Total												

* Negligible

TABLE C-5—contd.

Persons engaged													
1. Agriculture and livestock husbandry	...												
2. Non-agricultural occupations—													
(a) Small scale manufacturers and handicrafts													
(b) Trade	...	...											
(c) Transport	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
3. Services, professions, etc.	...	...	...										
4. Employees of owner	...	...	...										
5. Dependants	...	...	...										
Total	...	...	...										

TABLE C-5—contd.

	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)	(vii)	(viii)	(ix)	(x)	(xi)	(xii)
General category	Rs. crs.	Rs. crs.	Rs. crs.		Rs. crs.	Rs. crs.	Rs. crs.		Rs. crs.	Rs. crs.	Rs. crs.	
1. Agriculture and Animal Husbandry	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
2. Non-agricultural enterprises—												
(a) Small scale manufacturing and Handicrafts	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
(b) Trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
(c) Transport	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
3. Services, professions, weighs, etc.	...	...	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	...	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	...	[illegible]	[illegible]
4. Liquidation of loans	...	...	...	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	...	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	[illegible]	[illegible]
5. Miscellaneous	...	...	...	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	...	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	...	...	...	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	...	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

From the above table it is seen that average annual gross income of predominantly agricultural families in Border area, Project area and General area are respectively Rs. 1,035, Rs. 1,095 and Rs. 874. Apparently it appears that people in the General area are poorer than those in Border area. This however cannot be said to be true, for, from a consideration of the distribution of families in table G-1 it will be seen that average income figures for Border area and Project area are in fact inflated due to existence of a number of families in higher income group.

To the income of families in Border area agriculture and Animal husbandry contribute 58 per cent followed by Labour-service-profession which contribute 34 per cent (Labour includes agricultural labour also). Miscellaneous sources such as charity remittance, loan realised, etc., contribute 1 per cent. Others in order of importance are liquidation of assets, non-agricultural enterprises such as Trade, Cottage Industries, etc., which respectively account for 4 per cent, 3 and per cent only.

In project area main contributors are agriculture and Animal husbandry and Labour-service, profession etc.. accounting for 48 per cent and 36 per cent respectively followed by Liquidation of assets, and non-agricultural pursuits such as trade and cottage industries which respectively contribute 8 per cent and 5 per cent of the families total gross income.

Main contributors to family income in General area are in order of importance agriculture, Labour-service, profession, etc.. non-agricultural enterprise, and Liquidation of assets, which respectively accounts for 53 per cent, 36 per cent, 6 per cent, and 4 per cent of the families total gross income.

It is also seen that of the total average income of families, value of items produced at farm or at home and consumed at home account for 16 per cent of the families total annual gross income in Border area, 27 per cent in Project area and 35 per cent in General area. Thus average annual cash receipt of an agricultural family in the three areas comes to 84 per cent, 73 per cent and 65 per cent respectively, of the families average gross annual income, *i. e.*, Rs.1,035·06, Rs.1,095·33 and Rs. 873·90 respectively.

Components of average annual net income per family

Village group	Type of family	Average income per family							Average loss per family	Average net income per family
		Agriculture and horticultural income	Non-agricultural enterprise: Small scale industries, cane and handicrafts	Trade	Services, professional and wages etc.	Livestock or income	Miscellaneous	Total		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
A. Border area	1. Agricultural families.	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	2. Non-agricultural families.	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	..	..	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	...

TABLE C-1—Continued

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
B. Illegitimate	1. Number									
	2. Percent									
Total	—	—								
									—	—
C. Divorced	1. Number									
	2. Percent									
Total	—	—								
									—	—

4.4 Considering non-agricultural families it is seen that average gross annual income per family in Border area, Project area and General area are respectively Rs.[illegible], Rs. [illegible] and Rs.[illegible] respectively. The main contributor to this income in Border area is Trade followed by Service, Profession, Labour and Agriculture and Animal husbandry. Same in Project area are Labour-Service-Profession followed by Trade, small scale manufacture and agriculture and Animal husbandry. The comparatively higher average income from small scale manufacture and handicraft is due to existence of quite a good number of liquor distillers with quite a large amount of annual income. Main contributor to gross annual income of non-agricultural families in General area in order of importance are agriculture and animal husbandry, service-profession and labour. It is significant that among the non-agricultural families also agriculture and animal husbandry emerge to be the biggest contributor. This is due to the fact that in General area villages there are a large number of Nepali families whose principal occupation is cattle rearing and earned enough by selling milk, ghee, and livestock. These families were classed as non-agricultural families.

4.5 Of the gross income, agriculturists spend a portion in their farms on items such as purchase of seed, manure, etc., cost of maintenance of livestock, wages and salaries for labourers, and transport of produce while other spend a portion on running their household enterprises such as purchase of merchandise for trading, purchase of plants and machinery and raw materials for household enterprises, wages and salaries for employees, etc. The net annual income per family, as will be evident from table G-6, comes to Rs. [illegible] in Border area, Rs. [illegible] in Project area and Rs. [illegible] in General area. The corresponding figure for agricultural families being Rs. [illegible], Rs. [illegible] Rs. [illegible] and for non-agricultural families Rs. [illegible], Rs.[illegible] and Rs. [illegible] respectively.

The following table shows the annual expenditure of families in running their enterprises.

TABLE C-7

Consumption Expenditure

Items	Border area			Project area			Control area		
	No. of items bought by sales	Average value of sales (Rs.)		No. of items bought by sales	Average value of sales (Rs.)		No. of items bought by sales	Average value of sales (Rs.)	
		per capita per family (Rs.)	per family (Rs.)		per capita per family (Rs.)	per family (Rs.)		per capita per family (Rs.)	per family (Rs.)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1. Food									
2. Agricultural inputs (a)									
(a) Fertilizers									
(b) Insecticides and manures									
(c) Others									
3. Clothing									
4. Furniture & Gives									
5. Plant & machinery tools, etc. for livelihood enterprises									
6. Others									

It is to be seen that proportion of families purchasing livestock is highest in all the three areas, followed by that purchasing agricultural tools, implements. Considering investment for living, building is conspicuous in all the three areas, contributing largely towards a net investment is seen in all the three areas. Others of expenditure on food and agricultural items.

5.1. **Consumption expenditure of the family.** — The following tables show the broad pattern of the average family consumption expenditure in the three villages/areas. The components of annual expenditure on food, clothing and other items of consumption which determine the standard of living of the rural families are discussed separately.

Size of average family :- In Border area 5.7 members,
Project area 6.0 members and
Control area 6.7 members.

TABLE C-8

Household Consumption Expenditure

Items	Urban area				Project area				Control area			
	Cash expenditure	Obtained in kind & imputed at rates	Total	P.C.	Cash expenditure	Obtained in kind and rates imputed at rates	Total	P.C.	Cash expenditure in	Obtained in kind & imputed at rates	Total	P. C
	(Rs.)	(Rs.)	Rs.)		(Rs.)	(Rs.)	(Rs.)		(Rs.)	(Rs.)	(Rs.)	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Foodstuff —	—											
1. Cereals —	—											
2. Pulses —	—											
3. Vegetables —	—											
4. Fruits & Nuts —	—											

TABLE C.5—contd.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
5. Milk & milk products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
6. Oil & oilseed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	[illegible]	[illegible]
7. Meat	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	[illegible]	[illegible]
8. Fish	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
9. Eggs	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	...	...	...
10. Sugar	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	[illegible]	[illegible]
11. Salt	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total—Food	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
B. Non-food :												
12. Tobacco, Pan, etc.	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	[illegible]	[illegible]
13. Liquor, etc.	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
14. Fuel & Light	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15. Toilet	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	...	[illegible]	[illegible]
16. Textile incl. Textile leaf	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total—Non-food	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

TABLE C.A.—contd.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
C. Miscellaneous:												
(i) Breweries and aerated water												
(ii) Distilleries and Bhatties												
(iii) Clothing & footwear												
(iv) Cycles/motor cycles and Accessories												
(v) Jewellery goods												
(vi) Soap/oil												
(vii) Electrical contractors												
(viii) Repair & maintenance of residential building												
(ix) Residential house building and land												
(x) Travelling												
(xi) Sport and others												
Total—Miscellaneous												
Grand Total												

varied between 1.66 per cent to 2.50 per cent in the three areas. It is very likely that the figure will be an underestimate due to the fact that people addicted to it do not like to admit so. The existence of a large number of licentious liquor distilleries - numbering upto 5 in a single village, and the brisk trade in these distilleries bear testimony to the fact that a large share of family income is drained out through liquor.

Among miscellaneous items clothing and bed-wear accounted for nearly 4 per cent in Barbil area, 5 per cent in Jhagpur area and 5 per cent in Cuttack area. Next to it in importance is medicine and doctor which accounted for above 3 per cent of the total annual expenditure in all the three areas.

Generally speaking, the comparatively high percentage of expenditure on food and low percentages on other items like clothing, houses and its repair, education, etc., indicates a low standard of living of the rural families in general.

5.8. It may be of some interest to know how the families belonging to various economic groups divide their income between their current living expenses and other outlays on goods and services. The picture of the family expenditure pattern is summarised in the following table.

TABLE G 9

Analysis of family expenditure in different income groups

Sl. No.	Item	Income group (Rs.)											
		Below 101	101-150	151-200	201-250	251-300	301-350	351-400	401-450	451-500	501-550	551-600	Above 600
(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1.	No. of families	1	3	5	27	13	48	44	21	9	11	11	10
2.	Average gross income per family												
3.	Average savings per family												
4.	Average net income per family												
5.	Average expenditure per family												
6.	Proportion of expenditure on-												
(a)	Food												
(b)	Rent, rates and taxes												
(c)	Fuel and Lighting												
(d)	Clothing												
(e)	Miscellaneous												

TABLE G 5—contd

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Region/area—												
1. No. of families	...											
2. Average gross income per family	...											
3. Average saving per family	...											
4. Average net income per family	...											
5. Average expenditure per family	...											
6. Proportion of expenditure on—												
(a) Food	...											
(b) Rent, etc.	...											
(c) Fuel and lighting	...											
(d) Clothing	...											
(e) Miscellaneous	...											

TABLE G 9—contd.

Current Area— (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
1. No. of families	1	22	68	69	44	12		1	..	..	
2. Average gross income per family.	..	329 90	868 21	580 25	968 40	1210 64	1084 50	..	2752 00	..	..	..
3. Average earnings per family	..	80 40	20 05	13 00	149 11	277 45	342 00	..	740 00	..	..	..
4. Average net income per family.	..	07 00	80 22	526 [illegible]	800 57	1080 19	1206 42	..	2000 00	..	..	..
5. Average expenditure per family.	..	602 44	419 01	609 18	901 56	1126 92	1322 78	..	2329 16	..	..	..
6. Proportion of expenditure on—												
(a) Food.	..	72 [illegible]	62 91	70 05	76 88	75 61	69 69	..	97 64	..	..	..
(b) Tax, etc.	..	0 37	0 09	0 02	0 09	0 18	7 02	..	0 61	..	..	..
(c) Fuel and lighting	..	6 05	0 04	5 05	4 00	4 61	5 05	..	4 02	..	..	..
(d) Clothing	..	5 65	4 56	6 77	4 68	3 07	5 19	..	7 65	..	..	..
(e) Miscellaneous	..	11 92	23 96	13 01	9 19	9 07	12 23	..	87 09	..	..	..

19: Assam G-5 (1958) 1963 AR7 Khasi AR7

It is noticed that food is the largest single item of expenditure a every income level demanding about two-thirds or more of the average over all expenditure. It is significant to note that money outlays on food increase markedly at successive income level. This wide range of expenditure is the result of very low standard of food consumption in the low income groups and also possibly of increasing number of members per family in the higher income groups. 434 502 511

One striking feature revealed by the summary table of family income and expenditure given above is the average net deficit shown by the families of almost each income-group, except perhaps marginal surplus in respect of a few income-groups in the higher level. Thus for majority of the families the entire family income was not adequate on the average to meet current outlays on food and other necessities and comforts of daily living. Even the advantage of comparatively large average income was more than balanced by the larger differential increase in the family expenditure due either to their larger family size or comparatively higher standard of living or both.

426 Of the total number of loans 81 per cent in Border area, 18 per cent in Project area and 20 per cent in General area were free of interest while rate of interest for 9 per cent, 30 per cent and 60 per cent respectively of the loans in the three areas were found to be 20 per cent or more per annum which in cases ranged upto 200 per cent.

241 434 592 10.8. Farm output of 67 per cent of the families in Border area, 36 per cent of families in Project area and 60 per cent of families in General area were less than Rs. 500 a year, while 5 per cent, 30 per cent and 1 per cent of the families in the respective area earned more than Rs. 2,000·00 a year from their farms. Of the total number of farms fetching less than or Rs. 500.00 a year in Border area 35 per cent of them are medium sized farms and 4 per cent large sized farms, the corresponding proportions for Project area and General area being 21 per cent, 1 per cent, 27 per cent and 1 per cent.

24 433 10.9. In Border area the most important crops are oranges, betelnut, paddy, and betel leaf which respectively accounted for 31 per cent, 27 per cent, 19 per cent and 9 per cent of the total harvested area. In Project area paddy and orange are the most important crop which accounted respectively for 82 per cent and 3 per cent of the total harvested area. The most important crops in the General area are paddy and potato which respectively accounted for 61 per cent and 7 per cent of the total harvested area.

On the basis of data collected for all the villages investigated average yield per acre worked out at paddy 11.65 maunds, potato 21.61 maunds, oranges 5.77 lutis (5908 numbers) and betelnut 2.95 lutis (12980 numbers). These yield exhibited wide variation among the three areas.

434 592 10.10. Proportions of families with annual gross income of less than Rs. 750, Rs. 750 to less than Rs. 3,000, and above Rs. 3,000, were respectively found to be 49 per cent, 45 per cent and 6 per cent in Border area, 36 per cent, 60 per cent and 6 per cent in Project area and 45 per cent, 54 per cent and 1 per cent in General area. Average annual gross income per family worked out at Rs. 1,076·30 in Border area, Rs. 1,829.40 nP. in Project area and Rs. 864·36 nP. in General area which for predominantly agricultural and non-agricultural families respectively stood at Rs. 1,035·06 nP. and Rs. 1,161.91 nP. in Border area, Rs. 1,095·33 nP. and 1,644·36 nP. in Project area and Rs. 873.98 nP. and 780·84 nP. in General area. In all the three areas main contributors to family income were agriculture, service-profession-labour and trade accounting respectively for 41 per cent, 35 per cent and 15 per cent of the total average income in Border area, 37 per cent, 40 per cent and 9 per cent in Project area and 53 per cent, 36 per cent and 5 per cent in General area.

The net annual income per family in different income groups varied between Rs. 60 to 2,849 in Border area, between Rs. 110 to Rs. 3,508 in Project area and between Rs. 92 to Rs. 2,004 in General area. The average over all per family net annual income worked out at Rs. 853 in Border area, Rs. 989 in project area and Rs. 750 in General area and the same *per capita* at Rs. 231 in Border area, Rs. 215 in Project area and Rs. 153 in General area.

TABLE F-1.1

Number of farm by Gross output group

Size of farm	Number of household in the output group												
	0	Less than 100	100 to 250	250 to 500	500 to 1000	1000 to 1500	1500 to 2000	2000 to 2500	2500 to 3000	3000 to 3500	3500 to 4000	4000 & above	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Border Area:													
1. O	--	--	..	..	--	..	..	--	--	..	--	..	..
2. Less than ½ acre	6	28	9	..	..	..	..	..	.	--	..	..	71 (2·58)
3. ½ to ¾ acre ..	4	19	9	2	..	..	..	--	..	..	..	..	30 (3·25)
4. ¾ to 1 acre ..	6	33	29	14	1	--	--	..	--	..	..	..	79 (9·75)
5. 1 to 2 acres ..	11	31	21	24	5	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	99 (13·04)
6. 2 to 5 acres ..	10	34	24	30	12	2	2	..	..	1	--	..	105 (15·83)
Small Farm	37 (10·43)	145 (42·67)	93 (21·79)	60 (17·91)	18 (5·37)	3 (·90)	2 (·60)	.. ..	-- --	1 (·31)	..	..	358 (100·00)
7. 5 to 8 acres ..	5	25	39	49	29	4	3	2	..	..	..	1	147 (17·27)
8. 8 to 10 acres ..	7	8	28	37	60	24	6	5	3	..	1	3	182 (22·14)
Medium Farm	12 (3·81)	33 (10·48)	45 (14·29)	86 (27·30)	89 (28·25)	28 (8·89)	8 (2·54)	7 (2·22)	3 (·95)	..	1 (·32)	4 (1·27)	315 (100·00)

1623
423
592

*162 423 592

TABLE F-1.1—*contd.*

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)		(14)
9. 10 to 25 acres...	3	1	1	15	42	21	7	9	3	4	..	5		92 (12·91)
10. 25 to 50 acres	—	.	1	..	1	1	..	1	...	1	.	1		6 (0·79)
11. 50 and above	—	..	...	..	3	1	..	—	...	..	...	..		5 (0·66)
Large farms ..	3 (2·75)	1 (·91)	2 (1·83)	15 (13·76)	36 (33·03)	23 (21·10)	7 (6·42)	8 (7·34)	3 (2·75)	5 (4·59)	... ..	6 (5·50)		109 (100·00)
Total	50 (6·59)	177 (23·32)	120 (15·81)	161 (21·21)	143 (18·84)	54 (7·11)	17 (2·24)	15 (1·98)	5 (0·66)	6 (0·79)	1 (0·13)	10 (1·32)		759 (100·00)
Total cultivated area.	156·01 (3·99)	295·05 (7·55)	355·92 (9·09)	677·65 (17·31)	1,143·06 (29·22)	591·44 (15·06)	153·53 (3·93)	234·78 (6·00)	70·00 (1·79)	101.16 (2·66)	8·50 (·23)	120·70 (3·08)		3914·18 (100·00)
Average ..	3·12	1.67	2·97	4·21	8·00	10·95	9·03	15·65	14·00	7·36	8·50	12·07		..
Project Area:														
1. 9 ..	—	..	...	...	—	...	...	..	..	..	..	..		..
2. Less than 1/3 acre.	1	3	3	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	...	..		8 (1·57
3. 1/3 to 1/2 acre	1	4	1	—	..	...	..	..	..		..	..		5 (1·18)
4. 1/2 to 1 acre ..	3	6	12	10	..	..	.	—	..	—	..	..		3 (6·07
5. 1 to 2 acres ...	7	19	38	33	22	..	..	.	..	..	..	.		119 (33·28
6. 2 to 3 acres ..	5	9	15	5a	32	2	1	—	..	—	..	..		114 (22·22)
Small farms ..	17 (6·12)	41 (14·75)	69 (24·82)	93 (33·45)	54 (19·42)	3 (1.08)	1 (·36)	..	..	...	..	..		278 (100·00)

7.5 to 10 acres ...	2	6	7	29	57	8	2	..	..	..	..	..	111 (21·72)
10 to 19 acres ...	1	..	7	8	43	28	5	..	..	..	..	..	92 (18·00)
Medium Farm	3	6	14	37	100	36	7	..	..	..	..	..	203
	(1·48)	(2·95)	(6·90)	(18·23)	(49·26)	(17·73)	(3·45)	..	..	..	..	..	(100·00)
25 to 25 acres	—	...	1	3	4	2	8	4	4	1	1	2	30
	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	(5·87)
20 to 50 acres	—	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	—	..	—	..	..
50 and above	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Large Farm	..	..	1	3	4	2	8	4	4	1	1	2	30
	..	..	(3·33)	(10·00)	(13·33)	(6·67)	(26·67)	(13·33)	(13·33)	(3·33)	(3·33)	(6·67)	(100·00)
Total	20	47	84	133	158	41	16	4	4	1	1	2	511
	(3·91)	(9·20)	(16·44)	(26·02)	(30·92)	(8·02)	(3·13)	(0·78)	(0·78)	(0·20)	(0·20)	(0·39)	(100·00)
Total Cultivated Area	32·88	73·54	150·98	355·26	642·63	238·09	142·91	64·75	45·00	14·25	17·00	32·50	1809,79
	(1·81)	(4·07)	(8·35)	(19·64)	(35·53)	(13·16)	(7·90)	(3·57)	(2·45)	(·78)	(·94)	(1·80)	(100·00)
Average	1·64	1·56	1·80	2·67	4·07	5·81	8·93	16·19	11·00	14·25	17·00	16·25	..

1624
493
593

*1963 AR3 G92

TABLE F-1.1—*concld.*

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
General Area:													
1. 0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
2. Less than 1/5 acre ..		2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2 (1·17)
3. 1/5 to 1/2 acre ..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1 (0·58)
4. 1/2 to 1 acre ..		3	5	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11 (6·43)
5. 1 to 2 acres	1	3	16	14	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	40 (23·39)
6. 2 to 3 acres ..		1	9	13	12	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	37 (21·64)
Small Farm	1 (1·10)	9 (9·89)	31 (34·07)	32 (35·16)	18 (19·78)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	91 (100·00)
7. 3 to 5 acres	1	1	6	13	21	4	1	..	..	..	..	..	47 (27·49)
8. 5 to 10 acres	..	..	2	5	12	5	1	..	..	..	..	..	25 (14·62)
Medium farm	1 (1·39)	1 (1·39)	8 (11·11)	18 (25·00)	33 (45·83)	9 (12·50)	2 (2·78)	..	..	..	..	..	72 (100·00)
9. 10 to 25 acres	..	..	—	1	4	2	..	1	..	..	..	..	8 (4·68)
60. 25 to 50 acres	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
61. 50 and above	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Large Farm	..	..	..	1 (12·50)	4 (50·00)	2 (25·00)	..	1 (12·50)	..	..	..	..	8 (100·00)
Total ..	2 (1·17)	10 (5·85)	39 (22·81)	51 (29·83)	55 (32·16)	11 (6·43)	2 (1·17)	1 (0·58)	..	..	..	..	171 (100·00)
Total cultivated Area	4·50 (·78)	11·24 (1·95)	80·01 (13·90)	148·48 (25·79)	242·49 (42·11)	68·59 (11·91)	8·50 (1·48)	12·00 (2·08)	..	..	..	..	575·81 (100·00)
Average ..	2·25	1·12	2·05	2·91	4·41	6·24	4·25	12·00	..	..	..	..	..